

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 23 Oct 81	
TO: A11 NIOs & AG			
ROOM NO.	BUILDING		
REMARKS:			
FYI			
FROM:		C/NIC	
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION	

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 55

REPLACES FORM 36-8
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Code of Conduct for Former Employees

FROM: James N. Glerum Director of Personnel 5 E 58		EXTENSION 6825	NO. DATE 13 October 1981
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED	
1. General Counsel			<p>The attached memorandum was circulated in draft to those present at the 6 October EXCOM Meeting. There was no dissent on the assumptions or the basic thrust of the proposed code. (The DDA is not convinced that the code is required but, if it is, he endorses my approach.) Several of the respondents made useful suggestions for minor wording changes. These have been incorporated.</p> <p><i>/s/</i> James N. Glerum James N. Glerum</p> <p>Att</p>
2.			
3. Deputy Director of Central Intelligence			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			

01-2034

13 October 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM: James N. Glerum
Director of Personnel

SUBJECT: Code of Conduct for Former Employees

1. At the Executive Committee Meeting on 6 October 1981, you charged me with developing a Code of Conduct that should govern the activities of former employees. In responding to that charge, I have used the following assumptions:

a. The General Counsel will incorporate specific prohibitions into the employment contract.

b. No combination of law and employment contract will cover all the post employment activities which are potentially damaging to CIA.

c. The Code of Conduct goes beyond those activities specifically precluded by law or the employment contract.

d. The Code of Conduct will be without specific sanctions and must depend primarily on personal discipline and social (peer) pressure.

e. The Code of Conduct should be brief and broad in scope. (Most of the former employees now engaged in potentially damaging activities must be aware that they are doing so--or would be aware if they had been properly conditioned during their service.)

2. Based on the above assumptions, I propose something along the order of the following as the Code of Conduct:



STAT

Code of Conduct

Current and former CIA personnel are expected to maintain high standards of conduct consistent with the Agency's mission. Certain activities are restricted by explicit provisions of law and the CIA employment agreement. In addition, there has long been a tradition of discipline and loyalty to the Agency that has guided the conduct of Agency personnel in the performance of their official duties and in their private lives. The Agency continues to rely heavily on this discipline and loyalty, not only during the period of employment but, of equal importance, after employment. With respect to former personnel, the Agency expects, indeed depends on, continued adherence to the same high standards of conduct which governed them during their employment. Former CIA personnel are expected to avoid any personal or professional activity which could harm or embarrass the Agency or the United States. When former personnel have questions as to whether a proposed activity may fall within this Agency's concern, the Agency is prepared to provide guidance upon request.

3. The Code of Conduct is easily stated. Its effectiveness will depend on how it is implemented and, ultimately, to what extent it becomes part of our service discipline. Since the creation of CIA, its employees have understood that employment with CIA involved both special demands and acceptance of a unique trust. Despite individual aberrations, most CIA employees have or at least accepted the concept of service discipline. To most, this has been a matter of pride. The annual requirement to read HHB 7-1 and its predecessors also provided an annual reminder and a reinforcement of that discipline. We have not made a similar institutional effort to instill recognition of and support for a continuation of that same discipline after employment. (Perhaps the strong sense of an individual "social contract" between the employee and the service, which used to exist and which has been seriously damaged in recent years, made special emphasis on post employment largely unnecessary.) We need now to start focusing on post employment discipline, beginning with EOD. If handled properly, I believe most of our employees will accept this focus as a step in the right direction. It will not preclude the Wilson/Terpil type of situation, but as it becomes an integral part of service discipline, it might cause former employees to think twice and/or seek guidance before becoming involved in something questionable.

4. If you approve the proposed Code of Conduct in principle, we can develop precise wording and a recommendation for implementation and continuing education. As an obvious step, it should be included in HHB 7-1 where it will serve as an annual reminder.

/s/ James N. Glerum

James N. Glerum

STAT

SUBJECT: Code of Conduct for Former Employees

APPROVED:

Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

DISAPPROVED:

Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

Date: _____

Distribution:

Orig - Return to D/Pers

- 1 - DDCI
- 1 - ER
- 1 - GC
- 1 - DDO
- 1 - DDA
- 1 - DDS&T
- 1 - D/NFAC
- 1 - IG
- 1 - Compt
- 1 - D/EEO
- 1 - D/OPP
- 1 - D/Pers Subject
- 1 - D/Pers Chrono

D/Pers/JNGlerum:rj (13 October 1981)

STAT